

Exhibit 6

(Exhibit 27 to Jeffries
Declaration at ECF No. 256-26)

Lawyer Reviews - Summary Reviews

Associate: Cardwell, Kaloma
 Reviewer: Kreynin, Leonard
 Review Date: December 19, 2016

1. Review Type:

Annual Review

2. Principal matters worked on by the reviewee which were considered in the evaluation:

1. [REDACTED] (05487/122) - 143.5 hours
2. [REDACTED] (05903/011) - 126.5 hours
3. [REDACTED] (27962/161) - 99.5 hours
4. [REDACTED] (21075/879) - 56.5 hours
5. [REDACTED] (19361/010) - 55.6 hours
6. [REDACTED] (02731/004) - 55.3 hours
7. [REDACTED]
 (21075/943) - 53.8 hours

[September 2015 - September 2016]

3. Comments received from:

J. Butler, F. Campbell, S. Hudson, L. Turano, J. Amorosi, C. Bezeg, B. Friedman, j. Hall, L. Kreynin

4. Substance of evaluation (including reviewee's performance compared to expectations for a lawyer of the same seniority, strengths and weaknesses in the reviewee's performance in the last 12 months, improvements, if any, from prior year's review, etc.):

I met with Kaloma in the second half of Dec. 2016, before Christmas. I have expressed gratitude for his enthusiastic and positive attitude and hard work and noted that he was open to constructive criticism and improvement. I remarked that at least person noted significant improvement in the timeliness of his work compared to the last year and greater focus on hsi work.

I then said that there are significant areas for improvement that we identified and listed them. They were (1) the need to slow down, pay attention to detail and making sure that all of the details that need to be

reflected in the document are there, (2) asking questions to be sure what you are doing and why, (3) seeking to understand key aspects of the overall transaction, and (4) conveying more confidence so that people working with you know that you have a good handle on the matters delegated.

Kaloma pushed back and asked for specific examples, at which time I pointed out issues that we had with exclusivity agreements for Hoffmaster deal, such as mismatch between parties and signature pages and changes that he made which were adverse to our client. He accepted that but asked for other specific examples which I said that I didn't have at hand. The conversation remained friendly despite the pushback by him and concluded with me saying that we plan to meet again in June 2017 to discuss whether there have been improvements in these areas.

5. Did the reviewee receive a commendation for his/her pro bono work or recruiting efforts?

Yes

6. Comments from the reviewee regarding his or her evaluation of his or her performance.

See above.

7. Developmental priorities for the next year (including types of matters, level of responsibility, training, etc.)

See above

Submitted on: 3/28/2017, 6:03 PM